

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 03 2006

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FELICITAS ESPINOZA and JOSE
CUPERTINO ESPINOZA,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

Nos. 05-77207 and 05-77215

Agency No. A95-451-234

Agency No. A95-451-233

ORDER

Before: PREGERSON, TALLMAN and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Respondent's motion to consolidate petitions for review 05-77197, 05-77207, 05-77215 and 05-77236 is granted in part. Petitions for review nos. 05-77207 and 05-77215 are consolidated.

We have reviewed the petitions for review and motions for stay of removal. We conclude that petitioners have failed to raise a colorable constitutional claim to invoke our jurisdiction over this petition for review under the REAL ID Act, Pub. L. No. 109-13, Div. B, 119 Stat. 231 (2005). *See Torres-Aguilar v. INS*, 246 F.3d 1267, 1271 (9th Cir. 2001). Accordingly, respondent's motion to dismiss these petitions for review for lack of jurisdiction is granted because we lack jurisdiction to review the Immigration Judge's discretionary determination that petitioners did

05-77207

not demonstrate exceptional and extremely unusual hardship under 8 U.S.C.

§ 1229b(b)(1)(D). *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(I); *Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439

F.3d 592, 596 (9th Cir. 2006); *Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 929-30

(9th Cir. 2005); *Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 892 (9th Cir. 2003);

Montero-Martinez v. Ashcroft, 277 F.3d 1137, 1144 (9th Cir. 2002).

All other pending motions are denied as moot. The temporary stay of removal and voluntary departure confirmed by Ninth Circuit General Order 6.4(c) and *Desta v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2004), shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

DISMISSED.

PREGERSON, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

I dissent. This case, and the sixty-four others like it filed today, will have an adverse effect on children born in the United States whose parent/parents are illegal immigrants. When a parent is denied cancellation of removal, the government effectively deports the United States-born children of that parent. This unconscionable result violates due process because circumstances will force children to suffer de facto expulsion from the country of their birth or forego their constitutionally protected right to remain in this country with their family intact.

05-77207

See, e.g., Moore v. City of E. Cleveland, 431 U.S. 494, 503-05 (1977) (plurality opinion) (“Our decisions establish that the Constitution protects the sanctity of the family precisely because the institution of the family is deeply rooted in this Nation’s history and tradition.”); *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645, 651 (1972) (recognizing that “[t]he integrity of the family unit has found protection in the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment”).

Furthermore, as a nation we should recognize that many children born of illegal immigrants serve and have served with honor and distinction in our military forces, and many have laid down their lives on the altar of freedom.